

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated April 4, 2008 and in conjunction with the filing of an RCE. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested. In this Final Office Action, claims 1, 6-8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 22-24, 26, 27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Bauer (U.S. 2003/0197739). Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Bauer. These rejections are respectfully traversed.


Claim 1 and all the independent claims of the present application clearly recite two distinct features of the invention. Specifically, each independent claim recites that boundaries are defined to form a window area on at least one computer monitor display, and those boundaries are then saved. Thereafter, one or more applications, each associated with a different window (separate and different from the window area) are assigned to the window area. Changing the size of the window area also changes the size of each window within the window area. Further, each window within which an application is executing may be moved or snapped to one boundary or another within the window area defined by the boundaries. As defined in the dependent claims, one or more additional applications may be assigned to execute within the same window area and moved from boundary to boundary within the window area responsive to function keys executed on the associated keyboard. The claims have now been further amended to clarify that each individual window is of a different size than the total window area in which the window appears.

In addition, the claims further recite that a plurality of windows may be defined (see Figure 2, for example) and that applications may be assigned to co-execute within each of these windows, without being coextensive with the windows. In this way, a very flexible system is defined for moving multiple applications around within predefined windows that do not necessarily occupy the entire monitor screen. Further, more than one window area defined by a set of boundaries may be created on any single screen or set of screens. Therefore, a significantly enhanced ability to open and follow the execution of multiple applications within a single monitor array or a plurality of cooperating monitors is achieved.

On the contrary, as clearly disclosed at paragraphs [0023] and [0025] of the newly-cited Bauer reference, each application that is opened occupies its own window area. That window area may be changed, and the application moved about the screen, but there is no teaching of creating boundaries of a window area and saving them separate and apart from the application window itself. Further, the various applications shown in Bauer are moved about the screen and changed in size without reference to separately defined and saved window area boundary. Also, the applications can only be moved about the entire window screen and cannot be moved to the edge of a previously defined and stored window area boundary.

In view of these fundamental distinctions between the reference cited and the pending claims, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Carey
Registration No. 51,580
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant